

II. REMARKS

The Examiner is requested to reconsider the application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks. It is believed that no new matter has been added.

Applicant wishes to express great appreciation for the Examiner's interview, and Applicant responds to the Office Action as follows.

In Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the Substitute Specification pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 132(a). The Examiner states that the Substitute Specification contains new matter, as is more precisely stated in the Office Action.

In response, the objection is respectfully traversed because the original application included an incorporation by reference that provides the basis for the material added in the Substitute Specification.

In Paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, claims 187-251, 299, and 300 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 112, first paragraph. The Examiner states that the claims do not comply with the written description requirement.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed. Attention is again drawn to the incorporation by reference whereby the written description requirement has been satisfied.

In paragraphs 6-7 of the Office Action, claims 187, 188, 213, 241, 243, and 245 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 102(e). The Examiner states that these claims are anticipated by Tengel, as is more precisely set out in the Office Action.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed because not all claim requirements have been shown in Tengel, including secondary trading of the products of the class... etc. required in the rejected independent claims. Consider also the claimed intermediation.

In paragraphs 8-9 of the Office Action, claims 189-212, 214-240, 242-244, 246-

251, 299, and 300 have been rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. Sec. 103. The Examiner states that the claim requirements are obvious over Tengel in view of Zandi.

In response, the rejection is respectfully traversed because:

- (1) all claim requirements have not been shown in the cited art;
- (2) the contended combination of teachings to reach the claimed invention would render the cited art inoperable for their respective purposes;
- (3) the contended combination of teachings to reach the claimed invention would change the principles of operation of the devices shown in the respective art; and
- (4) no motivation or suggestion has been shown in the art that, as of the date of the instant application, would have prompted one skilled in the art to make the combination to reach the claimed invention.

As discussed above with respect to the Sec. 102 rejection, Tengel has not been shown to teach certain claim requirements, and Zandi has not been shown to teach them either. Thus, (1) no combination has been shown to teach the claim requirements, and (2)-(4) relate thereto.

Withdrawal of the objection and rejections is respectfully requested. In furtherance of prosecution, formal drawings are submitted herewith, and the Abstract has been amended to reduce the number of words to comply with the word limit set by PTO rule.


Once again Applicant expresses appreciation for the Examiner's interview, and the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below, if it can in any way expedite prosecution.

III. FEE

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with the above-identified patent application or credit any overcharges to Deposit Account No. 50-0235. Additionally, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (312) 240-0824 if it can in any way expedite or ease the handling of this case. Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned at the address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12 June 2006



Peter K. Trzyna
(Reg. No. 32,601)

P.O. Box 7131
Chicago, IL 60680-7131
(312) 240-0824